



DRAFT

**Monthly Report:  
November**

**FY2022**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	25	23	20	23	17	20	22	23	24	30	23
<b>Harrisburg</b>	51	39	35	39	30	34	28	34	27	31	29
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	16	16	11	8	10	8	8	10	12	15
<b>St. Charles</b>	37	34	37	34	36	34	30	36	35	27	28
<b>Warrenville</b>	21	24	23	21	20	202	17	13	18	22	24
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>119</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	21.4	22.8	20.6	20.8	19.2	19.1	17.9	22.6	22.6	26.9	25.8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	44.6	45.5	39.4	38.0	34.9	31.6	33.3	32.4	25.7	28.7	30.5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	11.0	13.0	16.1	13.4	9.7	10.6	8.2	9.5	9.3	11.9	13.3
<b>St. Charles</b>	31.4	34.5	33.5	38.4	35.9	33.1	38.9	34.5	38.7	29.1	27.2
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.8	22.1	25.7	22.0	21.5	21.1	15.5	15.0	14.8	21.8	23.3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>130.2</b>	<b>137.9</b>	<b>135.3</b>	<b>132.7</b>	<b>121.3</b>	<b>115.4</b>	<b>113.7</b>	<b>114.0</b>	<b>111.2</b>	<b>118.5</b>	<b>120.1</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	82	79	78	72	72	79	78	78	78	74	
<b>Harrisburg</b>	131	130	130	129	126	121	119	126	124	122	
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	46	44	44	42	37	43	43	45	42	42	
<b>St. Charles</b>	135	133	127	129	126	133	124	126	126	123	
<b>Warrenville</b>	65	61	60	59	56	68	61	60	59	56	
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>417</b>	

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Seven Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	100%	95.8%	95.5%	65.5%	65.2%	68.2%	73.9%	95.7%	91.7%	80.6%	72.7%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	60.6%	68.3%	57.1%	56%	56.5%	82.1%	72.7%	69.2%	47.8%	60.9%	65.9%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	36.8%	55%	59.1%	60%	38.5%	41.7%	57.1%	69.2%	66.7%	61.5%	52.6%
<b>St. Charles</b>	49.0%	43.1%	41.0%	45.8%	48.9%	42.9%	33.8%	47.3%	56.3%	41.1%	43.6%
<b>Warrenville</b>	75%	72%	74.2%	56%	58.3%	59.1%	58.3%	57.9%	78.3%	69.2%	63.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>62.8%</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>54.6%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>58.2%</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>59.3%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	2.6%	46.1%	39.0%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	1.5%	45.3%	47.4%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>March</b>	0.7%	48.9%	44.1%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	0.7%	38.3%	51.8%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	0.9%	43.6%	49.1%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	0.8%	39.4%	47.7%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	0.8%	49.6%	42.0%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	0.0%	40.3%	51.3%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	0.0%	36.0%	57.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>October</b>	1.6%	31.0%	60.3%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	0.8%	31.5%	60.6%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>40.9%</b>	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	3.16%	3.80%	17.72%	25.32%	50.00%
<b>February</b>	3.33%	2.00%	13.33%	26.00%	55.33%
<b>March</b>	3.27%	4.58%	14.38%	26.14%	51.63%
<b>April</b>	3.31%	2.65%	13.91%	28.48%	51.66%
<b>May</b>	2.52%	1.68%	15.13%	21.85%	58.82%
<b>June</b>	2.31%	2.31%	11.54%	21.54%	62.31%
<b>July</b>	0.78%	3.88%	14.73%	17.83%	62.79%
<b>August</b>	0.00%	1.52%	12.88%	22.73%	62.88%
<b>September</b>	0.00%	2.08%	9.72%	20.83%	67.36%
<b>October</b>	0.72%	2.90%	20.29%	19.57%	56.52%
<b>November</b>	0.00%	4.96%	19.83%	19.83%	55.37%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>1.76%</b>	<b>2.94%</b>	<b>14.86%</b>	<b>22.74%</b>	<b>57.70%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	9	12	13	11	10	10	13	11	12	9	11
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	13	11	9	11	8	8	7	8	8	8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	19	20	22	20	13	12	14	13	12	13	19
<b>St. Charles</b>	8	7	7	5	6	6	8	7	6	5	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	9	8	8	8	10	7	6	4	7	7	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>54</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	-	118	143	67	-	-	38	102	92	126	113
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	64	-	46	121	80	-	55	104	86	95
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	97	-	159	-	116	-	62	172	103	65	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	44	-	-	42	-	70	-	56	-	28
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	82	5	-	93	-	23	-	116	105	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>87</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Successful Completion</b>	46.2%	46.7%	30%	23.8%	33.3%	25%	50%	35.7%	53.8%	37.5%	25%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	7.7%	0%	10%	9.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	6.3%
<b>Youth Released</b>	30.8%	33.3%	50%	61.9%	57.1%	75%	40%	42.9%	30.8%	25%	31.3%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	15.4%	20%	10%	4.8%	9.5%	0%	10%	21.4%	15.4%	12.5%	37.5%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Marijuana</b>	77.8%	81.7%	82%	86.8%	88%	95%	93.9%	85.7%	75.6%	73.8%	74%
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.7%	5%	3.3%	3.8%	0%	0%	0%	2.4%	2.2%	2.4%	3.7%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	14.8%	11.7%	13.1%	9.4%	12%	5%	6.1%	11.9%	22.2%	23.8%	22.2%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	3.7%	3.3%	1.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 1 reported cocaine, 2 reported opioids, 4 reported amphetamines, 1 reported benzodiazepine, and 4 reported ecstasy.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	14	13	13	11	9	12	9	16	16	24	18
<b>Harrisburg</b>	33	31	34	30	26	24	27	27	31	24	31
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	10	15	11	8	7	5	6	8	6	9
<b>St. Charles</b>	12	13	11	13	11	11	16	15	12	16	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	12	14	15	14	13	14	10	7	10	12	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>88</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	16	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	13	13	13
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	7	7	6	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	4	4	6	4	4	4	4	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>35</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	1.2	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.2	0.8	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.6	0.7	1.0	0.7	1.8	1.0	1.6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.2	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.5	2.3	2.3	2.5	1.8	3.3	1.3
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.3	2.3	2.0	3.0	1.3	2.0	2.7	3.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.4</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	12.0	10.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	4.6	4.2	4.2	4.0	2.0	3.4	0.4	3.8	2.8	3.8	2.0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7.0	4.0	7.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	2.0	3.5	2.5	5.0	6.0	9.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	1.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.0	4.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.



Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	0	1	3	3	2	4	0	0	3	1	19
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	1	2	3	13
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	3	12
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	4	2	3	8	6	7	8	1	3	7	8	57

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	50%	61.5%	61.5%	72.7%	77.8%	50%	55.5%	37.5%	43.8%	50%	55.6%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	69.7%	67.7%	61.8%	66.7%	38.5%	70.8%	7.4%	70.4%	35.5%	62.5%	32.3%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	53.8%	40%	46.7%	45.4%	62.5%	14.3%	40%	66.7%	25.0%	66.7%	33.3%
<b>St. Charles</b>	50%	61.5%	54.5%	53.8%	45.4%	36.4%	43.8%	33.3%	16.7%	37.5%	69.2%
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7%	28.6%	26.7%	50.0%	46.2%	42.9%	20%	42.9%	40.0%	33.3%	47.1%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	53.6%	55.6%	52.3%	59.5%	49.3%	50%	26.9%	52.1%	41.6%	50%	45.5%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	3	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	5
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	12	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	4
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	15	9

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	7	50%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	7	10%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	8	4	2	7	3	3	0	6	4	8	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	16	10	8	9	8	16	6	7	7	6	11
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	20	6	9	1	3	1	1	4	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	11	17	16	9	7	12	5	16	19	17
<b>Warrenville</b>	8	9	11	3	10	9	7	9	4	11	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>52</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	37.4	17.5	9.7	33.7	15.6	15.7	0	26.5	17.7	29.7	27.1	<b>21</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	35.9	22.0	20.3	23.7	22.9	50.6	18.0	21.6	27.2	20.9	36.1	<b>27.2</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45.5	153.8	37.3	66.9	10.3	28.3	12.2	10.5	43.0	0	0	<b>37.1</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	35.0	31.9	50.7	41.7	25.1	21.1	30.8	1.4	41.3	65.3	62.5	<b>37</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	40.7	42.8	13.6	46.5	42.7	45.2	60	27.0	50.5	73.0	<b>43.5</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>43.3</b>	<b>32.7</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	4	5	4	4	3	1	3	1	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	5	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	1	1	4	0	1	1	2	5	3	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	5	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	4.7	4.4	4.9	4.8	0	0	0	4.4	4.4	11.2	3.9	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13.5	8.8	10.2	13.2	11.4	12.7	9.0	3.1	11.7	3.5	9.8	<b>9.7</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38.5	18.6	14.9	10.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>7.5</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2.9	3.0	10.4	0	3.0	2.6	0.6	12.9	10.3	18.4	<b>5.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.2	9.0	11.7	4.5	4.7	9.5	6.5	26.7	6.8	22.9	17.2	<b>11.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>7.9</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	3	0	0	6	1	2	0	3	1	4	5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	5	3	4	3	9	3	6	2	4	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	9	2	2	0	0	1	0	4	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6	12	9	4	3	4	1	9	10	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	1	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>22</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	14.0	0	0	28.8	5.2	10.5	0	13.3	4.4	14.9	19.4	<b>10.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	20.2	11.0	7.6	10.5	8.6	28.5	9.0	18.5	7.8	13.9	19.7	<b>14.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	18.2	69.2	12.4	14.9	0	0	12.2	0	43.0	0	0	<b>15.4</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	15.9	17.4	35.8	23.4	11.1	9.1	10.3	0.3	23.3	34.4	25.7	<b>18.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.2	9.0	7.8	4.5	9.3	14.2	19.4	13.3	13.5	4.6	17.2	<b>11.1</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>14.2</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	4	3	1	0	2	1	0	2	2	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	2	1	2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	6	1	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	4	4	3	5	3	7	2	2	6	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	5	6	1	7	4	3	3	1	5	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	18.7	13.2	4.9	0	10.4	5.2	0	8.8	8.8	3.7	3.9	<b>7.1</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.2	2.2	2.5	0	2.9	9.5	0	0	7.8	3.5	6.6	<b>3.4</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27.3	46.2	6.2	37.2	0	28.3	0	10.5	0	0	0	<b>14.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	19.1	11.6	11.9	7.8	13.9	9.1	18.0	0.6	5.2	20.6	18.4	<b>12.4</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	18.3	22.6	23.3	4.5	32.6	19.0	19.4	20	6.8	22.9	38.6	<b>20.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>10.5</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	2	2	1	3	3	1	0	1	1	2	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	4	1	1	2	0	2	3	0	1	5	2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	5	8	6	3	1	5	2	2	3	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	4	2	3	0	1	0	0	4	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	2	0	0	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	35	26	30	16	21	24	20	18	15	11	23
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	8	0	3	2	6	1	1	2	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	16	16	22	8	4	7	17	5	17	36	39
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	46	37	21	29	20	18	35	10	29	46
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>111</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	24	16	0	0	9	0	0	12
<b>Harrisburg</b>	78	57	76	42	60	76	60	56	58	38	75
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	9	62	0	22	21	57	12	11	22	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	51	46	66	21	11	21	44	15	44	124	143
<b>Warrenville</b>	101	208	144	95	135	95	116	233	68	133	197
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>92</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	48	90	-	-	53	-	-	115
<b>Harrisburg</b>	147	136	104	86	155	110	134	100	92	122	105
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	37	56	-	55	96	84	80	208	13	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	64	73	63	71	165	74	156	635	132	80	73
<b>Warrenville</b>	122	90	131	69	96	64	54	65	33	68	94
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>89</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	1	-	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	8	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	1	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds





## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth Monitored by Aftercare

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	509	498	482	475	460	446	430	435	419	404	402
<b>Youth in Community</b>	224	225	224	221	229	205	210	213	205	184	187
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	121	110	106	101	83	90	84	86	84	94	91
<b>Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	140	139	134	133	133	135	123	123	122	113	114
<b>Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	24	24	18	20	15	16	13	13	8	13	12

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (Average per Specialist)

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	8.4	8.2	7.5	7.3	7.1	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.6	6.3	6.3
<b>Youth in Community</b>	5.5	5.5	5.1	5.0	5.2	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.2	4.2
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	3.0	2.7	2.4	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.1

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – November 2021

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	8	36	4.5	30	3.8
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	12	4	10	3.3
<b>Aurora</b>	2	14	7	14	7
<b>Rockford</b>	4	23	5.8	19	4.8
<b>Peoria</b>	4	21	5.3	16	4
<b>Belleville</b>	7	37	5.3	28	4
<b>Champaign</b>	4	34	8.5	27	6.8
<b>Springfield</b>	3	17	5.7	11	3.7
<b>Placement</b>	6	63	10.5	14	2.3
<b>Intensive</b>	3	21	7	15	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>4.2</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – November 2021

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	97	2.7	91	3
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	48	4	40	4
<b>Aurora</b>	46	3.3	46	3.3
<b>Rockford</b>	86	3.7	76	4
<b>Peoria</b>	84	4	80	5
<b>Belleville</b>	133	3.6	128	4.6
<b>Champaign</b>	110	3.2	106	3.9
<b>Springfield</b>	54	3.2	52	4.7
<b>Placement</b>	148	2.3	64	4.6
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>4.0</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	5	5	0	0
<i>February</i>	6	5	1	0
<i>March</i>	3	3	0	0
<i>April</i>	2	0	2	0
<i>May</i>	2	2	0	0
<i>June</i>	4	2	2	0
<i>July</i>	6	4	1	1
<i>August</i>	7	5	2	0
<i>September</i>	5	4	1	0
<i>October</i>	9	5	4	0
<i>November</i>	5	5	0	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>February</i>	83.3%	16.7%	0%
<i>March</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>April</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>May</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>June</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>July</i>	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%
<i>August</i>	71.4%	28.6%	0%
<i>September</i>	80%	20%	0%
<i>October</i>	55.6%	44.4%	0%
<i>November</i>	100%	0%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>73.3%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	46	19	28	26	16	23	23	32	36	26	18
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	4.3%	0%	7.1%	11.5%	6.3%	8.7%	8.7%	12.5%	13.9%	11.5%	22.2%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	18	29	33	30	36	17	35	26	36	18	22
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	83.3%	93.1%	90.9%	90%	86.1%	94.1%	94.3%	96.2%	91.7%	88.9%	86.4%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	15	28	30	28	33	16	34	25	33	16	23
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	25	34	41	28	28	35	21	30	29	35	21

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	November 2021	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	2	11.1%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	1	5.6%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	0	0%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	11	61.1%
<b>New Commitment</b>	0	0%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	4	22.2%
<b>Return Additional Mittimus</b>	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, November 2021**



## Section 10: TRD Data for November 2021

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	90	10
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	39	15
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	40	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	115	9
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	51	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>45</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Delinquent Discretionary Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	5	0	2	39	17	<b>63</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	2	2	6	1	2	<b>13</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	15	7	6	5	3	<b>36</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	2	15	4	14	6	<b>41</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	9	5	9	4	4	<b>31</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	57	10	13	52	19	<b>151</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	10	15	0	9	11	<b>45</b>

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	3	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	10	6	3	3	4	7	0	3	14	14	10
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	18	10	4	10	7	7	4	0	8	2	15
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	4	17	15	2	7	6	2	0	3	0	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	5	6	8	3	7	6	8	3	5	8	9
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	1	4	5	0	5	5	0	2	2	2	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>45</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/21	2/21	3/21	4/21	5/21	6/21	7/21	8/21	9/21	10/21	11/21
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	8	6	6	7	4	5	-	4	5	8	6
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	7	8	10	6	9	5	4	-	12	10	7
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	18	8	16	10	8	7	11	-	5	0	-
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	9	10	11	8	4	10	10	4	7	6	8
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	45	8	12	-	10	4	-	8	5	5	8
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: November 2021

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	74	49	7	63
<i>Moderate</i>	19	37	40	28
<i>Low</i>	1	8	47	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>

Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	17	-	-
<i>High</i>	15	89	61
<i>Moderate-High</i>	23	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	23	1	27
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	6	-	-
<i>Low</i>	6	0	2
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	5	-	-
<i>High</i>	7	20	17
<i>Moderate-High</i>	27	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	25	21	40
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	18	-	-
<i>Low</i>	7	5	32
<i>None</i>	1	44	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>




**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	1	0	1	0	5	19	<b>27</b>
February	0	6	2	1	1	4	14	<b>28</b>
March	0	5	1	0	0	2	18	<b>26</b>
April	2	1	0	4	0	5	16	<b>28</b>
May	0	4	0	2	0	2	21	<b>29</b>
June	1	2	0	3	0	2	16	<b>24</b>
July	0	4	1	4	2	7	12	<b>30</b>
August	0	6	0	8	0	2	14	<b>30</b>
September	0	0	0	1	0	5	15	<b>21</b>
October	0	1	0	3	0	3	12	<b>19</b>
November	0	1	0	4	0	2	10	<b>17</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month



## Demographic Profile for November 30th, 2021

Sex	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	109	93.2%	298	96.4%
Female	8	6.8%	11	3.6%

Age	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average Age	17.6		18.5	
16 & Under	34	29.1%	44	14.2%
17 to 20	81	69.2%	241	78%
20.5 & Over	2	1.7%	22	7.1%

Race/Ethnicity	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	23	19.7%	48	15.5%
Black	78	66.7%	215	69.6%
Hispanic	11	9.4%	24	7.8%
Native American	0	0%	1	0.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	1	0.3%
Multi/Biracial	5	4.3%	20	6.4%

Committing Counties <sup>1</sup>	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cook	23	19.7%	70	22.7%
Collar Counties	8	6.8%	29	9.4%
Metro-East	7	6%	24	7.8%
Central	41	35%	105	34%
Southern	12	10.3%	22	7.1%
Northern	26	22.2%	48	15.5%
Out of State	0	0%	11	3.5%

<sup>1</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State

Offense Class	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Murder	8	6.8%	1	0.3%
Class X Felony	34	29.1%	70	22.7%
Class 1 Felony	35	29.9%	90	29.1%
Class 2 Felony	28	23.9%	110	35.6%
Class 3 Felony	10	8.5%	12	3.9%
Class 4 Felony	2	1.7%	15	4.9%

Offense Class by Race	Black	White	Hispanic	Bi/Multiracial
Murder	4	1	3	0
Class X Felony	84	12	10	2
Class 1 Felony	90	19	7	9
Class 2 Felony	88	30	10	10
Class 3 Felony	6	9	3	4
Class 4 Felony	14	2	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>25</b>

*This table provides a summary of all youth in DJJ (both facilities and Aftercare) relating to their race and holding offense crime class. The numbers in the table and the raw number of youth in a category and the percentage are the percent of a particular racial group in a category.*

Prefix	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Court Evaluation	9	7.7%	1	0.3%
Delinquent	62	53%	270	87.4%
Extended Jurisdiction	9	7.7%	4	1.3%
Felon	30	25.6%	0	0%
First Degree Murderer	3	2.6%	1	0.3%
Habitual Juvenile	1	0.9%	13	4.2%
Violent Juvenile	3	2.6%	9	2.9%
From Other State	0	0%	11	3.6%

## Aftercare Completion – November 2021

### Characteristics of Youth at Exiting Aftercare

*Youth exiting aftercare are youth that are being discharged from IDJJ custody and youth that are entering an IDJJ facility*

Sex	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
Male	1	4%
Female	24	96%

Age	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
Average Age	18.8	
16 & Under	3	12%
17 to 20	16	64%
20.5 & Over	5	20%

Race/Ethnicity	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
White	4	16%
Black	16	64%
Hispanic	3	12%
Multi/Biracial	2	8%

Committing Counties <sup>2</sup>	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
Cook	7	28%
Collar Counties	4	16%
Metro-East	1	4%
Central	6	24%
Southern	1	4%
Northern	4	16%
Out of State	2	8%

<sup>2</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State



Offense Class	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
Murder	0	0%
Class X Felony	4	16%
Class 1 Felony	5	20%
Class 2 Felony	8	32%
Class 3 Felony	3	12%
Class 4 Felony	3	12%

Prefix	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
Court Evaluation	0	0%
Delinquent	21	84%
Extended Jurisdiction	1	4%
Felon	0	0%
First Degree Murderer	0	0%
Habitual Juvenile	0	0%
Violent Juvenile	1	4%
From Other State	2	8%

Discharge Reason	Aftercare Exits	
	Number	Percent
Admitted to Institution	4	16%
Aftercare Discharge	10	40%
Adult Sentence Discharge	3	12%
Transfer to Adult Parole	0	0%
Court Ordered Discharge	3	12%
Discharged from Illinois Custody	2	8%
Statutory Discharge	3	12%
Death	0	0%

## Youth Outcomes at Discharge from Aftercare – Year to Date

*These are youth to date youth outcomes are for youth discharging aftercare and excludes youth still under IDJJ supervision in facilities*





## Percent of Youth Completing Conditions

